

Cp304
R45r1

Refugees, etc. etc.]
REYNOLDS

The Library
of the
University of North Carolina



Collection of North Caroliniana

Cp304
R45r1

UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL



00037521351

FOR USE ONLY IN
THE NORTH CAROLINA COLLECTION

Refugees; Restricting the Admission of Immigrants; Registration of Labor Unions and Prohibiting Aliens or Communists as Officers Therein; The National Debt; Request made of Democratic and Republican Platform Committees for American Nationalist Objectives; Care of Returning Veterans and War Plant Workers

Speeches of
Hon. Robert R. Reynolds
of North Carolina
in the
Senate of the United States
August 7, 10, and 11, 1944

*Not printed
at Government
expense*

United States Government Printing Office, Washington : 1944

SPEECHES

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

August 11, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, relative to the subjects which I have discussed here this afternoon, namely, the stopping of all immigration for the next 5 years, and the registration of labor unions, I wish to state that I directed letters to Hon. ROBERT TAFT, chairman of the platform committee of the Republican Convention at Chicago, and Hon. JOHN McCORMACK, chairman of the platform committee of the Democratic Convention at Chicago. I ask that those statements be published at this point in the RECORD, without my taking the time to read them.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR REYNOLDS DECLARES AMERICAN NATIONALISTS GAIN

"The American Nationalists Committee of Independent Voters is progressing most satisfactorily," stated United States Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS recently when questioned in regard to the progress of the newly formed committee.

This committee was created some several weeks ago, at which time its temporary national chairman, Senator REYNOLDS, issued a press release to the effect that American Nationalists were preparing to launch a movement which would cover the entire United States.

The committee has its headquarters located at 215 First Street NE., Washington, D. C. Indications are, according to its temporary national chairman, that this committee will develop into an organization much larger than the America First Committee which was sponsored by leading Americans prior to Pearl Harbor. At the present time it has members from every single State of the entire Union, and at a later date it is understood that units of 10 will be organized throughout the entire country. It is the intention of those in charge of the organization work to bring about the setting up of units in every block of every city, on every street of every village, and in every township of every county throughout the entire country.

The plan calls for the development of units of 10 individuals, no more than 10, say the organizers, so that every member of every unit will know personally the individuals constituting that unit. By this means subversive elements will not be able to worm their way into the organization and begin

boring from within as was experienced by a number of the chapters of the America First Committee.

After units have been organized throughout the United States, then State directors will be set up and these State directors in all probability will be selected by the chairmen of the hundreds of units in each State, according to the Senator.

When questioned about the attacks made by radio commentator Walter Winchell, pertaining to the organization of this national committee, Senator REYNOLDS said:

"Frankly, I welcome these attacks. Winchell has on two occasions fired at the American Nationalists Committee and as a result of his attacks we have received thousands of letters throughout the country requesting information about the objectives of the committee. We never would have received all these inquiries if it had not been for Mr. Winchell's publicity. As a result of these letters we have secured thousands of new members. Really, a knock from Winchell is a boost for any real American organization. We American Nationalists believe in tolerance. However, we believe that tolerance is a two-way street and we are of the opinion that it should be practiced by those who preach it.

"In the minds of some people, anyone who speaks out in the interest of America, anyone who speaks out against internationalism, is a Nazi Fascist, or a traitor to his country. Just say one word against communism and you will be damned from one end of the country to the other by certain people. Say what you will—American thoughts are returning to American shores and this country is headed toward nationalism. The fact is, it is here now because the people are realizing that Mr. Churchill, of England, is looking after the British Empire; Mr. Stalin, of Russia, is looking after the Soviet Union, and the American people are now beginning to demand that American leaders look after the interests of America first and not last."

Joint Resolution 9

Resolution by REYNOLDS would require unions to make accounting to dues-paying members; bar aliens from serving as officers of unions, etc.

1. Why? Because 90 percent of the members of all the unions want this bill enacted into law for their own personal information and benefit. They would appreciate a statement of what becomes of the monthly dues which each year amount to millions of dollars.

2. Why should the unions not be required to register and show their source of income and disbursement? All American business firms and individual citizens, also all political parties, must file a statement with the Government showing their incomes and disbursements.

This accounting feature adopted by amendment to the 1944 tax bill requiring labor unions to render financial accounting to Federal Government.

3. Why should aliens be allowed to enter the United States and become officers of labor unions? Aliens are without rights in any country except as visitors, but such aliens as Harry Bridges and many others have defied the laws of this country.

4. Why should racketeers be permitted to serve as officers in unions, using the unions as a source of illegal income without making a report to their unions in many instances and to the Government?

5. Senator REYNOLDS' compulsory registration bill, known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 9, is designed to stop these practices. This resolution has the backing of millions of American citizens, which includes members of labor unions, business concerns that employ labor, and the mothers of our soldiers and sailors.

6. The opposition to this bill consists of a small minority under the leadership of certain labor racketeers. The time is here to put a stop to these practices.

UNION ACCOUNTING ACT UPHELD IN DAKOTA

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., August 1944.—Constitutionality of 1943 South Dakota legislation requiring labor unions to file annual statements of income and expenditures with the secretary of state upheld by Circuit Judge Lucius J. Wall.

[From the National Record of August 1944]

PLATFORM PLANKS SUGGESTED BY AMERICAN NATIONALISTS FOR REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES

Senator REYNOLDS, temporary national chairman of American Nationalists Committee of Independent Voters, addresses letter of suggestions to chairmen of the platform committees of the two major parties. It reads:

Hon. ROBERT TAFT,
*Chairman, Platform Committee,
Republican National Executive
Committee, Chicago, Ill.*

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,
*Chairman, Platform Committee,
Democratic National Executive
Committee, Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As temporary national chairman of the American Nationalists' Committee of Independent Voters, I respectfully desire to submit herewith suggestions for planks in your platform now formulating for the 1944 Presidential campaign, upon which, naturally, senatorial and congressional candidates (nominees) will base their arguments.

Before outlining the suggestions and objectives submitted herewith, I respectfully wish to advise for your information and that of your committee associates, that the mem-

bership (Nation-wide) of the American Nationalists' Committee of Independent Voters is made up of Democrats, Republicans, and independent voters. These parties designated, Democrats, Republicans, as well as independent voters, are American nationalists who believe in looking after the interests of America first and not last.

The American Nationalist believes:

1. That we should be for America first and not last. We should look after the interests of our own people and our own country before attempting to fee, finance, rehabilitate, and clothe the entire world.

2. That when these wars have been won in every part of the globe we should bring our boys home to their loved ones, their fathers, and their mothers, their sweethearts, and their wives—no international police force.

3. That we should not merge our Government with any other government of the world, and we should not give up any part or portion of our sovereignty to become a portion of a world state.

4. That we should have a strong, free America, politically, economically, and militarily independent of any and all European and Asiatic powers.

5. That we should stop all immigration now. More than 600,000 aliens have entered this country since the present war began on September 3, 1939. This should be stopped at once. These people coming here will never leave. We should save all jobs for our men and women, boys and girls in uniform, who are fighting throughout the world.

6. That there should be protection of American labor, industry, and agriculture against cheap European and Asiatic labor by maintaining adequate protective, but not exploitive, tariffs.

7. That we should encourage free enterprise, individual initiative, the American system of government, providing opportunities for all.

8. That we should maintain friendly relations with all nations that show a sincere desire to cooperate.

9. That we should have government by legislative action solely as provided in the Constitution and Bill of Rights and complete separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

10. That decentralization of Government and restoration of States' rights in its fullest sense is desired, together with the introduction of sound business practices and economies in the conduct of the National Government.

And above all we are opposed to rule by Communists, their fellow travelers—the pinks—and deplore the practice of employing Communists, or any one imbued with communism, nazi-ism, or fascism, in any division of our Government.

The afore-mentioned "beliefs" and objectives of we American nationalists are vital to the future of our country, in our opinion, and we sincerely trust and hope that your committee may recommend and that your

convention will adopt planks covering our objectives.

However, we are particularly anxious that planks be adopted by your committee, recommending:

(a) The immediate stoppage of all immigration to this country now so that all jobs may be preserved for America's returning soldiers (male and female) and for the protection of American labor. When this war will have ended, millions of men and women now in uniform will be returning to American soil from all parts of the world. They will be looking for jobs, their old jobs or new jobs. The millions of Americans now engaged in industry in this country will be displaced immediately after the war because, in our opinion, reconversion will not come sufficiently rapidly to absorb them. Therefore, it is necessary to preserve and maintain every available job for American citizens. If we permit the influx of aliens into this country such as has taken place since war began in Europe on September 3, 1939, then we will permit this influx of aliens to take the jobs that rightfully belong to American nationalists.

An order has been issued by the President permitting 1,000 aliens, refugees, to enter the United States and to occupy abandoned camps of the Army. This is merely the opening wedge. Once the foot is in the door endless thousands will follow. The explanation given is that they are in the way in Italy. It would be much better to transfer them across the Mediterranean and place them in camps in north Africa where they could be more speedily returned to their homelands when this war is over. Once these refugees and aliens are permitted to come here they will never be returned because already there is a campaign in progress to keep them here after the war and not return them to their respective homelands. We are desirous of protecting American labor and for that reason we demand the stoppage of the influx of refugees and the stoppage of all immigration through our gates to American soil.

(b) That any alliance or alliances of a permanent nature with any country or countries be discouraged where our sovereignty would be endangered or wherein our Nation would be prohibited free and independent action. We insist upon a pledge of United States collaboration with world nations to prevent war where such collaboration will not endanger or curtail the sovereignty of this Nation. We all seek peace, but we first want to win the war and win it at the earliest possible moment with a view to saving American lives. We should pledge ourselves to protect the interests and resources of the United States and maintain our position of supremacy on the sea, on land, and in the air because, in our opinion, the best protection against war and for peace insofar as we are concerned is to look after our own national defenses in the Western Hemisphere, concentrating these defenses from the Panama Canal to the Arctic Zone. In resolving

for peace we respectfully insist that any peace to be derived at will be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. We are opposed to an international police force. We respectfully insist that the interests of America be considered primarily and firstly, and we are opposed to any world-wide W. P. A., and to our spending billions of dollars throughout the world to educate those of other countries to our way of life, such as has been suggested through legislative proposals and now before one of our committees here. In other words, we insist upon America discontinuing to be the Santa Claus of the 2,000,000,000 people on the face of the earth and revert to America's looking after the interests of America.

We think that any plank relating to the war and peace should embody a clear declaration in definite terms pertaining to our objectives. Ambiguous plank resolutions will only tend to more confuse the people. America is entitled to know the aims and the definite objectives of our country, and we hope that a plank pertaining to this particular feature will speak plain, understandable language, and will be definite, without ambiguity, and to the point. We all know where we are, but now the American people are demanding to know where we are going.

(c) That all labor unions and organizations be required to register with the Federal Government and provide the authorities thereof and the dues-paying members of their respective locals and units with semiannual reports of financial statements embodying receipts and expenditures of these respective labor organization and that no alien, Communist, Nazi, Fascist, or any member of any subversive organization be allowed to hold office in any labor union or organization.

(d) That the Department of Labor be reorganized and that the innumerable administrative agencies (about 26 of them) dealing with labor subject be at once coordinated and placed in the Department of Labor under the direction of a Secretary satisfactory to labor itself. We believe this to be necessary for the promotion of America's well-being in the establishment of favorable labor psychology in securing fair and sound labor relations.

(e) In further respect to labor, we are of the opinion that experience has time and again shown that the National Labor Relations Act should be amended requiring the National Labor Relations Board to carry out both the spirit and the purpose of the act. We believe that the workers should be vested with the authority to ascertain for themselves the kind and character of a collective bargaining agency which would be suitable and serviceable to them; that the Board should not be permitted to arbitrarily determine the kinds of collective bargaining agents for the workers employed in industry but that this authority should be conferred upon the workers themselves. We believe this to be the democratic procedure.

(f) That plank recommendations may be embodied in your platform pertaining to the elimination of waste, unnecessary expenditures in the employment of surplus Government workers, and a resolution calling for the reduction of taxes immediately after the expiration of the war to the extent of prohibiting the Federal Government from exacting of individual taxpayers more than 25 percent; this, of course, taking into consideration the fact that individuals must pay State and county taxes, and innumerable other taxes, many of which are hidden.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in enclosing herewith a copy of The American Nationalist, which is the official organ of our national committee.

With assurances of my highest esteem, I beg to remain,

Very respectfully yours,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Temporary National Chairman,
American National Committee,
215 First Street NE.,
Washington, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

August 10, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, observers who have toured the far-flung areas of the world where Americans are daily jeopardizing their lives to beat down our enemies and preserve the integrity of our Nation are unanimously agreed that all of our men abroad dream and long for the day when the fight won, they can return victorious to the United States to the homes, the families, the hallowed places and institutions whose value is now thrice enhanced by the bitter price we have paid to keep them secure.

Let me say at this time that I am opposed to any world-wide military force. I wish to have our boys and our girls in uniform returned home the minute the present struggle is over, and I hope and pray to the great God above that there never again will be occasion to fight on foreign shores. I pray that if there is ever again occasion to fight at all, it will be to fight only in defense of and on our own shores. The longer our men see and endure the ravages of war in other lands, the more America becomes to them an oasis in a world of arid devastation. It is a powerful image, which spurs them on to overwhelm our enemies and to return to our own beloved country to resume the arts of peace and to devote their energies to the continuing

betterment of our own way of life, which I hope and pray they will find to be as good as when they left it.

What will we have to offer to the men who, all through the hell of war, carry in their hearts this glowing vision of America, the men whom we have asked to postpone all the comforts, the blessings, the fulfillment of which are the birthright of every American? Our men under arms are fighting for a land of peace and plenty. They are winning that fight. Their hopes are high. Their disillusionment will be all the more grim and their anger the more profound if they return to find that a faltering economy at home denies them the welfare, the security, and the happiness for which they have risked their lives abroad. I refer to both the men and women of our armed forces who are serving on foreign shores and in every sphere of the entire world.

Mr. President, we must not fail our fighting men. We will not shirk our responsibility to lay the basis now for a post-war America which will give meaning to their sacrifices. That must be an America whose productive mechanism is running in high, offering to every returned serviceman an opportunity to contribute his skills and participate in a national peacetime period. It is an America which will produce abundantly the goods and services which our veterans will desire, and which will provide them the means for their acquisition. It is an America which can tolerate no waste, either of manpower or of resources.

The peacetime fate of our veterans is inseparable from the prosperity of the country as a whole. To talk merely of job preference for veterans is to take a view so partial and short-sighted that it beclouds the true dimensions of the problem which faces us. Unless we take steps at once to provide work for all, the livelihood of the returned soldier will be completely dependent upon the conscience and the bounty of the individual employer—an uncertain future. And unless we take steps to assure full production, employers with the best will in the world will have few jobs to offer to the demobilized servicemen. We shall be confronted by the grim spectacle of war veterans competing for jobs with their fathers, sons, and brothers who, although they did not have the opportunity to fight for their country on the field of battle, have done yeomen service on

the home front in turning out food and weapons to win the war. The outcome is easy to foretell. Wages will be forced down, unemployment will spread, purchasing power will decline. With markets for goods thus shrunk, industrial stoppages will increase, thereby throwing more persons out of work and culminating in a crisis.

We have only to consult the pages of recent history in order to know that we must act now if we are to escape the chaos that engulfed us at the end of World War No. 1, and from which we never thereafter fully recovered. It is a matter of record that servicemen fared ill in the days and months which followed the November 1918 armistice. Returned heroes formed lines at employment offices, or walked the streets vainly searching for work. In metropolitan areas, many peddled "welcome home" signs and other articles to earn enough for bare survival.

I understand that when the war shall have ended we will have to dispose of approximately \$80,000,000,000 worth of surplus supplies which will be on hand. We will do well if we get back 10 percent of that \$80 billion.

In addition to that, I am told that we are going to be called upon to feed and cloth and support 20,000,000 people in Europe for 2 years after this war is over.

Furthermore, we have made expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars for lend-lease in order to help our allies in this war, that having been done because of the war emergency. And I hear that one of our allies, Great Britain, is going to call upon us to continue lend-lease after this war is over.

If Great Britain asks that lend-lease be continued to the extent of billions of dollars of the money of the taxpayers of this country after this war is over, I have no doubt that the Congress will vote it, but speaking for myself I shall vote against it, because I think we have arrived at a period in the history of this country when we should at least save one copper for the millions of unemployed whom we will have here.

Our debt is so rapidly spiraling and progressing upward by leaps and bounds that before this war shall have ended—I refer to the European war—we will have placed a burden upon the shoulders and the bent backs of the taxpayers of America to the extent of \$500,000,000,000.

Five years ago when I was voting against lifting the arms embargo, against

the repeal of the neutrality laws, against sending our soldiers outside the continental United States before there was a declaration of war, and against lend-lease, I predicted that if we became involved in the war it would cost us \$500 billion. We have already recognized the cost of the war to the extent of voting to increase the ceiling on the national debt to \$267 billion. It will go to \$500 billion. How it will ever be paid and when it will ever be paid is beyond my comprehension and beyond human knowledge.

I have before me a copy of the Washington Evening Star which contains an Associated Press dispatch from London dated August 8. I shall not read it all, but shall ask that the entire article be published in the RECORD. The article is headed:

British wary of issue, but want lease-lend after Nazis are beaten.

In the middle of the article it is stated:

The "mutual aid" program—

That is the program in regard to lend-lease—

should be continued until Japan is defeated.

The British are suggesting and I understand it has been discussed in high circles in this country—I do not know as to that, but it is so rumored—that lend-lease be continued after we lick the Germans. I say that it ought to be discontinued the day we lick them, because, if we were to continue lend-lease to Great Britain after the war is over every other country in the world will come forward and say "Me too! Me too! Me too! We want more of your billions." We are going to pauperize ourselves and we are going to find out that when this whole thing is over that we will not receive a "thank you" or have a friend upon the face of the earth.

Mr. President, we are too free with our money—not our money, no; we are not free with our money, but we are too free with the taxpayers' money; we are too free with the money that is earned by the man who produces and pays the taxes to the Government.

By the way, here is an article from the Washington Times-Herald of August 1, 1944, in connection with lend-lease. I stated a moment ago that I prophesied that if Great Britain got lend-lease after the war every other country in the world would want it. Italy is already after it. The Times-Herald article reads:

LEND-LEASE AID MAY BE EXTENDED TO ITALY

The State Department disclosed today that consideration is being given to a proposal for extending lend-lease aid to Italy. The proposal was made by the head of the new Italian Government, Premier Ivanoe Bonomi, who described his country's financial and economic condition as desperate.

Referring to Italy, I want to read from an article in the Washington Star of July 27. It will give the Senate some idea how the Italians themselves are criticising us for debauching their own people by throwing our money all around. Mr. President, can you imagine that? The article, dated Rome, Italy, July 26, reads in part:

The Allied armies dragged behind them an "elephantine bureaucracy," the Action Party newspaper Italia Libera said today in an article criticizing both Italians and their liberators.

Criticizing Italians and the Americans who are liberating them!

The article entitled "The Allies in Italy," said there was:

"A futile waste of means and energy * * * a show of infallibility where presumptuous ignorance, ingenuousness and fatuousness are evident * * * contradictions in the acts of authorities whose powers are not precise and are contrasting."

Then the article refers to divisions and jealousies and an excess of beggars who everywhere are holding out their hands for money.

The newspaper said the Allies considered "modern comfort as the supreme good" and sought luxury, good food, and entertainment.

And so forth. I shall not take up the time of the Senate by reading further from the article, but I ask that it be published at this point in the RECORD. It shows how we are throwing our money away.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIAN PARTY PAPER HITS "BUREAUCRACY" OF ALLIED ARMIES

ROME.—The Allied armies drag behind them an "elephantine bureaucracy," the Action Party newspaper Italia Libera said today in an article criticizing both Italians and their liberators.

The article, entitled "The Allies in Italy," said there was:

"A futile waste of means and energy. * * * A show of infallibility where presumptuous ignorance, ingenuousness and fatuousness are evident. * * * Contradic-

tions in the acts of authorities whose powers are not precise and are contrasting."

Turning to the Italians, the newspaper said, "We are forced to note much servility contrasting with often unnecessary pride, a vicious tendency to trickery and imbroglione * * * divisions and jealousies * * * an excess of beggars not always for poverty, but also for ignoble speculation * * * superficiality of judgment and irresponsibility in giving pledges."

The newspaper said the Allies considered "modern comfort as the supreme good" and sought luxury, good food and entertainment. It added that the Allies also sought out parties given by the aristocracy where "German lovers and spies of yesterday are not missing."

Allied armies were declared marked by: "An excess of requisitions often unnecessary, an excess of public drunkenness with minor incidents * * * too much money in the hands of too many people, which results in new grave turmoil in the already tormented unbalance between wages and prices. * * * an abuse, fortunately infrequent, of the system which Prime Minister Churchill defines as the 'club and the carrot ends' with regard to the Italian ass."

The newspaper said, however, that never perhaps in the history of war was a people ever treated with greater trust and with greater understanding by authorities and by occupying troops.

"The Allies are waging a war which is to our advantage and they are winning it," it said. "The final result * * * will render very small and unnoticeable the inconveniences of today."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, speaking of money, we should begin to save a little. I have before me a newspaper containing an article under the headline "\$10,000 is a lot of money." The article reads:

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS IS A LOT OF MONEY (By Samuel B. Pettengill)

When the war ends the Nation's debt will average \$10,000 per family. It will be twice the total assessed value of all taxable property in the United States.

If you own a home or farm assessed for taxes at \$4,000, the average share of the debt against your property will be \$8,000.

In 1943 we spent as much as in the first 150 years of the life of the Republic.

Since Mr. Roosevelt entered the White House (counting all sums requested by him) we will have obligated the country in an amount equal to all the wealth accumulated on this continent since Columbus found it. This, on the authority of the man who knows, Senator Brann.

This means that in 12 years we will have incurred debt equal to the savings of 452 years—1492-1944. The debt of my home city of South Bend is \$2,570,000. By July first

its share of the Federal debt will be \$151,136,-000.

The present interest rate on the Federal debt is about 2 percent. South Bend's share of the interest alone will be \$3,190,000 annually.

This is \$620,000 more than the total municipal debt.

In interest alone, South Bend will have to pay more each year than its total city debt.

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND ELEVEN DOLLARS AND THIRTY-SIX CENTS PER CAPITA

For less money, it could in 1 year wipe out its entire city debt. And once paid, that is paid forever. But its share of the interest on the Federal debt will have to be paid each year.

Let's look at the debt load as it stands at this time and apply the figures to your home town. The per capita national debt is \$1,-511.36. Multiply your population by this figure and you will have your town's share of the Federal debt on July 1 next.

This brings the debt home.

In 1940 Texarkana had a population of 28,859. Its share of the Federal debt on July 1 next will be \$43,605,949. Its share of the interest charge will be \$920,602 annually.

Your city will tell a similar story. I mention Texarkana because it is the home of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN who is one of those who thinks nothing of debt when the war is over. The thought of putting any limit on debt and taxes is very obnoxious to him.

As our city fathers in council assembled voted bond issues against our homes of \$50,-000 or \$100,000 at a time, they debated the matter for hours. Mass meetings often remonstrated against further debt and taxes.

But the Federal debt is "different." Why is it different?

FEDERAL DEBT—MORE DANGEROUS

As a matter of fact, Federal debt is far more dangerous than city or county debt. For the Federal debtor issues the money of its creditors, some 50,000,000 bondholders—you are one—whereas cities and counties are forbidden to issue money. Every city and county in America could go bankrupt (as 3,000 of them did since 1932) and the American dollar would still be good. Only the cities' creditors would lose. If the Federal Government, however, should ever falter in its obligations, the value of every investment, life insurance policy, social security card, etc., would melt away like snow.

The war, of course, must be won, regardless of any necessary cost. But I am talking of post-war America, post-war spending, and post-war spenders.

I want to see your War bonds paid with honest dollars, and your insurance policies and social security cards.

What about the spenders? Do they care what happens to you?

People ask me—what can I do? The answer is simple. Put an X in the right square.

604805—8395

But first get a good man's name in front of the square.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I respectfully insist that we do any and all things possible for our servicemen and servicewomen who have been fighting courageously throughout the entire world. Furthermore, I respectfully urge that we do everything humanly possible for the men who have fought courageously in the plants and the factories on the home front in order that those on foreign fields might be properly supplied with the implements of defense and offense. I do not think there is anything too good for our soldier men and soldier women, and, as a matter of fact, I believe every Member of this body feels the same as I do about that, because we have voted for just about every request made at any time by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, by the Disabled Veterans of the World War, and by the American Legion. We have voted unanimously with them because we have recognized that they are deserving of all we could do for them, and we want to do everything that is humanly possible today for those who fight on foreign shores. At the same time we want to do everything humanly possible for the men and women who have struggled and who have worked in our factories and in our plants, as I have said, to supply the needs of war, whatever the amount may be. Let us vote for it, because we have distributed our money all over the world, and given away billions of dollars. No one knows how in the world we are ever going to pay it back, but let us give what little we have left to the people who deserve it; let us give it to Americans for once. For once, let us go all out for America.

August 7, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, about 6 months ago I cut out of the Times-Herald an article by Mr. Frank Waldrop. I read it with a great deal of interest, and I preserved it. It is entitled "The Great Lie." I wish to add a subhead which I would entitle "Facts Do Not Hinder Pravda, However, in Its Little Campaign To Put Over Everything J. Stalin Wants."

At approximately the same time I cut from the same newspaper the daily column entitled "These Charming People" by Austine Cassini. She makes mention of both England and Russia as being na-

tionalistic and imperialistic nations. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the two articles to which I have referred, together with another article which I cut out of the Washington News several months ago. The article was written by Mr. William Philip Simms and deals with Finland's present position. In the closing paragraph he states:

Finland's position today is tragic. She remains the same liberal republic she was in 1939-40—the toast of Churchill, Roosevelt, and democratic statesmen everywhere. But circumstances have made her an associate, though not an ally of Germany, and she is technically at war with Britain, her old friend

and admirer. And neither America nor Sweden can now do very much for her.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the three articles to which I have referred, because we now have before us the tragic situation of Finland and Poland, which today apparently is to be paritioned by one of our allies and taken over as the result of the organization of a committee which was founded in Moscow, and for the further reason that Finland, it appears, is trying to make some sort of deal with one of our allies, Russia, to preserve her life and to save what few of her cities and what few of her sons are left after the desperate struggle which has been waged along her far-away borders.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT LIE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Poles are becoming an absolute embarrassment to their great friends and allies, His Majesty's Government for the United Kingdom of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and the dominions beyond the seas.

The Poles keep insisting that Poland is Poland, temporarily occupied by the Germans, shortly to be occupied by the Russians—and so far as the Poles are concerned, again only temporarily.

That's the wrong attitude. The Poles should listen to reason. It is true that His Majesty's Government of the etc., etc., back in 1939, advised and urged the Poles to fight Hitler because he wanted to annex the Baltic seaport of Danzig and cut a short highway across Poland to reach it.

The Poles rightly took the view that Adolf was just getting the camel's nose under the tent insofar as their national independence was concerned, and so they hit the said nose as hard a whack as they could. While they were doing so, as all the world recalls, they

got a slug on the back of the neck from Adolf's great pal, J. Stalin.

And what role did His Majesty's Government for the etc., etc., play in this? Check the Encyclopedia Britannica yearbook for 1940 (which reviews the events of 1939) and you will there find the official details.

Briefly, Poland had her chance to tie in with either Germany or Russia as late as March 1939. Each was offering her a deal. But she refused them both and put her faith in His Majesty's Government. Why?

Well, on March 31, 1939, the British Prime Minister rose in the House of Commons and announced that the British Empire and the Republic of France had agreed to give Poland the fullest aid in their power "in the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence and which the Polish Government, accordingly, considered as vital to resist with their national forces."

All of which is ancient history, now, of course, and hardly worth mentioning except that one day the origins of this war will be called up for calm review and we will be given a chance again to think for ourselves concerning the genuine character of issues in Europe's eternal pursuit of war as the solution of its ills.

The great promise given at the outset of this war was that Britain and France would fight for Poland if she were attacked by any enemy whatsoever.

Half of that promise has been delivered. Britain declared war on Germany when Germany invaded Poland.

But the other half of that promise wasn't delivered when Russia attacked Poland.

And now, after many events, the Poles are still on hand to plague them.

Yesterday, the Communist official newspaper in Moscow, Pravda, began to warm up the Reds for the big developments just ahead by accusing the Poles in Poland of being—believe it or not—pro-Nazi.

The Germans have not, as yet, been able to produce a single Polish Quisling, which is more than can be said in the case of the Russians, for last year they turned up with a Russian Quisling government complete at Smolensk headed by a former general of the central Russian army, Anton Vlasoff.

Facts don't hinder Pravda, however, in its little campaigns to put over anything J. Stalin wants. At the moment, he wants territory and subjects cut out of the hide of Poland.

He'll get same, too. Who can stop him?

Not the British. Yesterday in London His Majesty's Government suppressed a Polish newspaper which has been published in London for 4 years.

Why? Because the Polish newspaper was getting too noisy about coming events and stirring up "discord among the United Nations." That, in the great citadel of democracy and the home of a free press, etc., etc., etc., as we have heard.

We don't suggest Americans meddle into all this going on abroad, but we can watch closely and form judgments on this meaning of promises, by whatever nation given.

THESE CHARMING PEOPLE

(By Austine Cassini)

There are definite signs of worry among high British spheres over the Roosevelt-Stalin flirtation. The President of the United States had always wished to meet the great Red leader and come to a closer understanding with him. F. D. R. finally met Marshal Stalin at Tehran and he was so impressed with him that he almost forgot Winston Churchill over it. Now it's no longer a secret among White House visitors that Joe has taken Winnie's place on the President's list.

What harasses the leading British minds is that this friendship of Roosevelt with Stalin may leave England, on many occasions, without the formidable backing of the United States in many involved diplomatic questions with the Soviet Union. For while England and Russia are allied in the war against Germany, it's already apparent that the views and plans that these two great powers have about post-war Europe are often conflicting. While there's undoubtedly an earnest effort from both sides to come to a peaceful and harmonious settlement of aims, nevertheless the British cannot abandon the traditional policies of the Empire any more than the Russians seem inclined to abandon their very successful and realistic present foreign policy.

The truth of the matter is this: Both England and Russia are fighting for nationalistic and imperialistic aims. We are the only ones who are fighting mainly for questions of ideology. That's why it's probably difficult for us to understand why England and Russia aren't as easy to please as we are.

In the past, England and Russia fought wars over these conflicting views. Russia's aim was always to expand toward the Middle East and India. But England was always there to stop her. Today Stalin, who is following the long-range policy of Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and Alexander II, sees this opportunity open for Russia again. Expansion to the Adriatic Sea through Slavic Balkan countries and through Iran and Iraq, where Soviet influence is greater every day, could be blocked only by England, who once again will have to invoke the policy of balance of power in Europe.

Stalin, however, seems to be catching the British out of breath every time. He's outstepping them. The move to recognize Badoglio caught Churchill completely unprepared.

And the deal between Stalin and Badoglio, one hears, is that Russia intends to guarantee the return of her colonies to Italy. That's a blow to England, naturally.

604805-8395

FINNISH PEACE BID

(By William Philip Simms)

A Finnish bid for peace with Soviet Russia, perhaps with the sub rosa and unofficial backing of the Swedish and American Governments, is believed imminent.

Asserting that Sweden's interests are in the main identical with those of Finland, the influential Stockholm liberal daily, Dagens Nyheter, is urging the Government "to back boldly in various ways a purposeful and realistic Finnish peace policy."

Here in Washington, Finland is still regarded as a democracy whose continued existence is vital to the post-war set-up in Europe. And Secretary of State Hull's blunt reminder that peace feelers were up to her and that failure to make them might result in serious consequences to herself, was advanced only in the most kindly spirit.

In fact, it is felt here that nothing but the most realistic approach can save Finland. According to the Swedish News Exchange in this country, the Morgontidningen, Stockholm's principal labor organ, openly expresses the deepest anxiety regarding Finland's fate. "Finland's independence," it declared, "may soon be at stake and less and less intervention can be expected from the western democracies."

It is no secret that Sweden is genuinely alarmed. There are close ties between her and Finland. Their middle-way democracies are much the same. Should Finland lose her independence to become just another Soviet Republic under Moscow, Sweden, and Norway, both of which share frontiers with her, would feel themselves menaced.

Few informed observers here, however, believe that either the United States or Sweden can be of much help to Finland. The Soviet press now regularly denounces her in violent tones. Apparently even unconditional surrender would not be enough to satisfy the Russians, who want to destroy the Finnish Army and punish the country. The bombing of Helsinki, they warn, is merely the beginning.

It is quite possible that Moscow would refuse to consider peace terms from Finland at this time. On the contrary, she may be bent on making a dependency of that country as she tried to do in 1939, but failed because Finland—unlike Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—accepted almost hopeless war rather than lose her freedom without a fight.

It is significant that on December 1, 1939, shortly after the outbreak of the Russo-Finnish war, a Soviet "government" was set up at Terijoki, just inside the Finnish border. At the head of this "government" was Otto Kuusinen, a Finnish Communist who had made his home in Moscow for 20 years. Within 24 hours Moscow extended recognition to the Kuusinen regime and announced the conclusion of a 25-year pact of mutual assistance.

Finland, however, was not the pushover expected. So she was able to get a compro-

mise peace in the spring of 1940. Sweden acted as go-between.

Finland's position today is tragic. She remains the same liberal republic she was in 1939-40, the toast of Churchill, Roosevelt, and democratic statesmen everywhere. But circumstances have made her an associate, though not an ally, of Germany and she is technically at war with Britain, her old friend and admirer. And neither America nor Sweden can now do very much for her.

COST OF POST-WAR LEGISLATION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there will come before the Senate tomorrow a bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from the great Commonwealth of Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] proposing a method of taking care of the unemployed, and, furthermore a bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs a couple of days ago will be printed and on the calendar and on our desks tomorrow, dealing with reconversion and other post-war matters, and taking care also of millions of men and women now in uniform who are soon, I hope and pray, going to be returned from the European sphere of conflict. The bill by the able Senator from Georgia and that of the able Senators from Montana and West Virginia deal with an all-important subject, a subject which is a part of the war in which we are now engaged and which we pray to Almighty God may soon be ended. These bills deal not only with taking care of the soldiers and reconversion and with unemployment, but with millions upon millions of men and women who have been employed and are now employed in industry, who have made sacrifices to go into industry to aid patriotically in the war effort in which all the 135,000,000 people of America are vitally interested. The program involves the expenditure of vast sums of money.

We have up to the present time expended billions upon billions of dollars; as a matter of fact, within the past 10 years, I dare say this Nation has expended more money than any nation or combination of nations ever spent within a specified time of 10 or 12 years. A few months ago we placed upon the national debt a ceiling of \$267 billion, which is more money than you or I, Mr. President, or anyone else can reasonably conceive within our respective minds. It is a sum so great that we can form no adequate conception of it. But despite the fact that we have a ceiling of \$267,000,000,000, which will have been reached no doubt by the 1st of January, after

which those interested in the financial structure of this country will have to come back to Congress itself and ask for an increase in the ceiling to the extent of many more billion dollars. I have predicted for the past 5 years that before the war shall have ended and its obligations liquidated the national debt will reach the enormous sum of \$500 billion.

We know that all that money eventually comes from the people. It comes from the man in overalls and the women in our factories who from day to day toil and sweat; it comes from the products of their labor. That money does not come from the rich or the wealthy of this country, because they have been reduced to the point where they get only 8 cents out of every dollar they receive as income or produce or receive from any source. I am reminded that if all the money that comes into our Federal Treasury through the taxing system from the so-called wealthy or well-to-do or the rich were placed at the disposal of the Government, there would not be sufficient even to pay for the maintenance and operation of one of the divisions of Government. We know, therefore, that taxes come from those who produce, from the laboring men and the laboring women and the great middle class, constituting the great masses of this country. So in considering the bill presented by the able Senator from Georgia and the bill reported from the Military Affairs Committee, introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KINGORE], it should be remembered that they are going to require billions of dollars in excess of the billions of dollars we are going to be called upon to pay in taking care of our returning soldiers.

Again I say that before this war shall have ended and before we have made a tabulation of its cost we will have a national debt far in excess of \$500,000,000,000. I arrive at that figure because I am reminded of the fact that the cost merely of taking care of the soldiers of World War No. 1, and their dependents up to date, according to the testimony of General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has aggregated \$15 billion, and before we shall have liquidated our obligations to the heroes of that war it will cost another \$15 billion, making a total of \$30 billion. During World War No. 1 we inducted in and out of uniform only about 4,200,000 men. During

the present war, before it shall have ended in Europe and in Asia and all over the world, we will have inducted in and out of uniform men and women in the Navy and Army, the Coast Guard, the Seabees, and the Air Forces at least four times the number we had in World War No. 1, and I dare say that our casualties before this war shall have ended certainly will have been in excess of four times the number of casualties that we unfortunately and heartbrokenly experienced during World War No. 1. That being the case, we will be obligated to pay to veterans of this war, as a result of this war, about \$130 billion.

All of that, Mr. President, must come from the people; it must come in a sense from the soil; it must of necessity be derived as the result of the labors of the great masses of the country. If the laborers and the masses of the country think that all that money is going to be paid by the wealthy and the so-called well-to-do they have an erroneous idea, because, after all, they themselves in the long run and in the finality have got to pay the cost. I make mention of these matters, as I stated a moment ago, to make it plain that the bills in question which are about to come before the Senate are going to cost billions upon billions of dollars; and therefore at the conclusion of my remarks, which is now, I ask that there be published in the body of the RECORD at this point a brief editorial by Benjamin De Casseres which concludes with the statement that "the power to tax is the power to enslave." This was published in the New York Mirror some months ago, perhaps 6 months ago.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD another editorial from the same daily of March 6, 1944, entitled "Taxes Unlimited."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the papers submitted by the Senator from North Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror]

THE MARCH OF EVENTS

(By Benjamin De Casseres)

Inch by inch, law by law, socialistic taxation crawls upon us.

First tax the pants off of us. Then we will be handed a pair of pants by the Government.

Inch by inch, law by law, the socializers will absorb all you've got. Then you can

live on the alms of the State and work on public improvements. You will be a number. You will be paid a cut-and-dried wage. If you strike you will be arrested as a subverter of the public welfare.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, to enslave.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of March 6, 1944]

TAXES, UNLIMITED

"The art of taxation consists in so plucking the goose as to obtain the largest amount of feathers with the least amount of hissing," said J. B. Colbert, nearly 300 years ago.

Which shows that with the march of the centuries the political goose-pluckers keep perfect step.

In the United States there is a movement afoot to put a curb on the taxing power of the Government that ought to interest us all, regardless of income or social position.

The New Jersey Senate recently requested Congress to consider a constitutional amendment restricting income and inheritance taxes to a maximum of 25 percent in normal times of peace.

New Jersey was preceded by 14 other States in asking Congress to submit such an amendment to the people.

The proposal has been introduced in both houses of the New York State Legislature.

When New York and New Jersey have joined the 14 States that have passed similar resolutions, the impetus ought to be sufficient to cause at least 20 other States to demand action.

The Constitution, from beginning to end, limits the powers of the Government. That is mainly why we have a Constitution.

Its plain intent is to prohibit infringement on the rights and property of the individual.

Now, the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1913, which is known as the "income tax amendment," is the one paragraph in the Constitution which gives the Government limitless and unrestricted power.

And this limitless and unrestricted power is over the most vital of the rights of the people—its income and its property rights.

Here is that amendment in its full wording:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumerations."

This blanket authorization, no matter what the intent, is complete—to the point of confiscation.

The logical historic result of such an all-devouring amendment was that, in 1923, the Communist Party of America in its platform adopted a plank declaring that all incomes should be limited to \$25,000.

President Roosevelt recommended to Congress last year that this communistic plank—destructive of free enterprise and our way of life—should become the law of the land.

Now, instead of limiting incomes to \$25,000, the saner and more American idea is being proposed that the Government shall be limited in peacetime to a 25 percent levy on incomes.

And that should, of course, also apply to inheritances.

The right to bestow money and the right to inherit money without the threat of confiscation through taxes is a fundamental American liberty.

It is a right found in the inherent nature of things—the right to own and the right to give.

Therefore, the revolutionary sixteenth amendment to the Constitution should be repealed and the 25 percent limit on taxing incomes and inheritances should be substituted.

Our Constitution limits the powers of Congress and the President, through the Supreme Court and by the Constitution itself, in all directions.

What argument, then, can be brought against limiting their powers to change our form of government through confiscation of income?

August 11, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the passage of the George bill—and evidently it will be passed if one is to judge by a preponderance of the vote registered a moment ago—will require the expenditure of several billion dollars with which to take care of our returning men and women in uniform, and also to take care of men and women who have been working in factories and plants on the home front.

We are called upon to make expenditures of billions of dollars to take care of the unemployed in this country. I shall vote for the George bill. I am very happy to be provided the opportunity of voting money for taking care of American citizens. But I am opposed to taking money out of the pockets of United States citizens and providing employment or upkeep or maintenance for any aliens. I believe that the taxpayers of this country are sick and tired and disgusted with having to pay for the maintenance and for the employment of those who are not American citizens. Therefore I shall provide the members of this body with an opportunity to say to the American taxpayers whether or not they want the American taxpayers to support non-American people who are in this country at the present time. I, therefore, offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

604805—8395

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place a new section reading as follows:

No alien shall be employed in any capacity in the administration of this act unless he has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask, therefore, in view of the fact that we are taking money away from our American taxpayers, why we should take their money to employ an alien to administer this act? I therefore ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I do not believe that American taxpayers should any longer be called upon to support aliens, non-American citizens. I do not think it is proper or right. Their burdens are beyond bearing at the present time. I therefore send to the desk another amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following new section:

No alien shall be entitled to any benefits under this act unless he has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In respect to that, Mr. President, I ask, why should we vote to take money out of the pockets of the taxpayers to pay noncitizens, aliens in this country? I ask for a vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not wish to do anyone an injustice. I do not know whether the amendment would do an injustice or not, but I understand a period of years has to elapse between the time a foreign-born person makes application for citizenship before he finally obtains citizenship. To all intents and purposes that person might be a part of our citizenry. He might have filed an original application, and he might have filed his second papers. I believe there are three stages.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not want the amendment to apply to anyone who has applied for American citizenship. I modify it to that extent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator also modifying his first amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the selective-service law, and also under the law permitting voluntary enlistments, which has been suspended on account of the draft law, there is an age limit beyond which no person can serve in the armed forces of the United States, not even a citizen. Does the Senator mean that anyone who happens to be in this country, who is an alien, who is beyond the age limit for military service so that he could not qualify under the amendment, would not be entitled to any benefits?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I certainly do mean that, because there are between five and six million aliens in the United States, and many of them have had more than 20 years in which to qualify for American citizenship, but have not done so. I say it is unfair for American taxpayers to have to continue to provide employment for noncitizens, or to provide money to sustain them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to give every member of this body an opportunity to be recorded on another question, a very important one. To repeat, which it is necessary that I do in discussing this particular amendment, the taxpayers of America are soon to be called upon to vote billions upon billions of dollars to be paid for many years to come in taking care of the unemployed. At the present time there are in this country between five and six million aliens. Many have been here for more than 20 years, but they have not thought sufficiently of this Government to make application for citizenship. Many have been here for less periods of time. As a matter of fact, aliens have been flocking to this country for years past, and are doing so now. The truth about the matter is that I have a report from the Department of Immigration in Philadelphia to the effect that since the present war began in Europe, on September 3, 1939, more than 580,000 aliens have come into the United States. How many have gone out of the country I do not know.

In view of the fact that our overburdened taxpayers in the United States are going to have to pay the unemployed, and in view of the further fact that we do not have enough jobs to go around, I

think the time has arrived when we should close the gates, and not let anyone come into the United States until we have provided jobs for the citizens of our country, jobs for our men and women in uniform all over the world, jobs for our men and women who are now in war plants, and who will be unemployed, and who will have to be taken care of by the taxpayers when the war is over. When the war ends the great flood of money will cease, and there are going to be many individuals who will be broke. There will be a great deal of trouble because people will want work. With respect to the few jobs there are my opinion is that we should give them to our own citizens. If we have any jobs I think we ought to give them to the men and women from our respective States who are now bleeding and dying all over the world to make free the lands of those who have come to this country from Europe and other parts of the world and who are taking jobs here while our boys are fighting to save their homelands. The time has come, I think, when we should not let another alien come into this country until we have provided jobs for our own people, because those of our citizens who will not be employed must be supported by the taxpayers of this country.

Therefore I submit an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SUSPENSION OF IMMIGRATION

SEC. —. (a) After the date of enactment of this act, and until the expiration of 5 years after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, no immigration visa shall be issued to any immigrant.

(b) Terms defined in the Immigration Act of 1924 shall, when used in this act, have the meaning assigned to such terms in that act.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, instead of taking the time of the Senate, I ask to have published at this point in the RECORD a statement submitted by John B. Trevor on behalf of the American coalition, made before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEES, 1944

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: Permit me on behalf of the American coalition to submit for your consideration the following statement in reference to the problem of refugees which has been raised by the President's message and the House resolutions which are now before the committee.

On June 12 the President, in a special message, advised Congress that he had authorized the making of arrangements for the entry into the United States of approximately 1,000 refugees. These refugees are to be placed, said the President, in a vacated Army camp on the Atlantic coast, were they would remain under appropriate security restrictions.

This order of the President raises two momentous questions, which demand the immediate and serious consideration of the Congress and the people of the United States. There is first the question of policy, and there is, then, the equally important question of constitutional law.

The policy of exclusion of refugees was considered in all its aspects following the First World War. Millions of people were not only displaced by war, but were in peril of extermination as a result of the revolutions which were the sequence of war in Russia, the Balkans, Hungary, and even in Germany itself. In the Russian terror, within a brief period, the Communist dictatorship slaughtered 1,800,000 men, women, and children under circumstances of ruthless barbarity. Two million or more fugitives from Russia alone clogged the highways and byways of the world. Millions more from all countries of Europe sought to migrate to the United States. The Honorable Albert Johnson, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at that time estimated the total to approximate 10,000,000 people. Lack of transportation alone checked the influx at its inception.

Congress, however, recognized not only the economic peril to our American standard of living, but also, appreciated the political menace which would be incident to the entry of millions of people whose traditions were radically different from those established in North America by the founders of the Republic. Therefore Congress passed the first quota law, known as the Immigration Act of 1921. The failure of this law to meet expectations resulted in the passage 3 years later, of a more stringent measure. That law is now in force and is known as the Immigration Act of 1924.

In addition to these laws, the Congress, since the last war, has placed upon the statute books a number of measures providing for the exclusion of certain classes of aliens such as anarchists, and members of other subversive groups of a revolutionary character.

A review of the history of the present administration's policy of enforcement of this legislation and its efforts to weaken its tenor or block any extension of the provisions of existing statutes is too well known to need any review here. It will suffice to recall that the act to register aliens was vigorously opposed by the administration until the advent of war made its passage by Congress inevitable.

In the autumn of 1942, the President sent a message to Congress asking that power be delegated to him to modify or annul any part or all of any immigration act then on the statute books. The reasons advanced in the President's message and the testimony of Government witnesses were wholly unconvincing and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives unanimously refused to report the bill.

The President has now revived the issue by ordering the admission of refugees outside of the regular immigration procedure. (See the President's cable to Ambassador Murphy published in the Department of State Bulletin of June 10, 1944.)

A careful analysis of the President's message of June 12 fails to disclose any moral or legal justification for this extraordinary action. The pertinent part of the President's message is summed up in the following words:

"Recently," said the President, "the facilities for the care of refugees in southern Italy have become so overtaxed that unless many refugees who have already escaped to that area and are arriving daily from the Balkan countries, can be promptly removed to havens of refuge elsewhere, the escape of refugees to that area from German-occupied territory will be seriously impeded. It was apparent that prompt action was necessary to meet the situation. Many of the refugees in southern Italy have been and are being moved to temporary refuges in the territory of other and friendly nations. However, in view of the number of refugees still in southern Italy, the problem could not be solved unless temporary havens of refuge were found for some of them in still other areas. In view of this most urgent situation it seemed indispensable that the United States in keeping with our heritage and our ideals of liberty and justice take immediate steps to share the responsibility for meeting the problem."

This statement by the President in his message to Congress on June 12 is amazing, because less than 2 weeks previously, in reply to a question at his news conference, Mr. Roosevelt said that he favored the establishment of "free ports" to facilitate the relocation of war refugees but that these ports need not be in the United States. (Cf. New York Times, May 31, 1944.)

The President might have added, if he had seen fit, that "since May 1, 1944, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation

Administration has been administering in the Middle East six refugee centers" and also that "Camp Marshall Lyautey, near Casa Blanca, is a joint United States-United Kingdom undertaking to which stateless and other refugees in Spain are being removed so that other refugees may be able to enter Spain from enemy occupied areas." (Cf. Department of State Bulletin, June 10, 1944.)

In other words, there is no demonstrable urgency which demanded the issuance of an order by the President to ship 1,000 refugees to the United States for entry "outside of the regular immigration procedure," as he stated in his cable to Ambassador Murphy, to which reference has already been made.

The policy of assisting refugees to reach north Africa and maintaining them until an opportunity is afforded for their repatriation is as commendable and defensible as their introduction into the United States in defiance of law is reprehensible and indefensible.

The Congress and the American people must understand that the order of the President providing for the entry of 1,000 refugees establishes a precedent which should not be countenanced. The refugee problem in Europe, and, indeed, elsewhere, is not to be settled by the admission into the United States of 1,000 aliens outside the regular immigration procedure.

The magnitude of the problem is suggested in the testimony of the Honorable Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, before a joint meeting of Deficiency and War Department Subcommittees of the House of Representatives on Foreign Relief. "Similarly," said Mr. Acheson, "when you come to the displaced persons problem, you have there something the like of which has never faced civilization before, so far as I know. You have in Europe 20,000,000 people who are away from their homes, in Asia probably 40,000,000 people. * * *

"Mr. TABER. Do you mean refugees?

"Mr. ACHESON. Yes, there are 20,000,000 of these people. Most of them are in a country other than their own country. They are not the responsibility of the country where they are now found; they are the responsibility of the country to which they are going. They cannot be turned loose and sent back to the country to which they belong until that country is prepared to receive them."

The fact of the matter is that the refugee problem so far as it concerns the United States is the problem of U. N. R. R. A. for which the administration has asked the Congress to appropriate \$450,000,000, with an authorization to use an additional \$350,000,000. That is to say a total of \$800,000,000 for immediate use out of the \$1,350,000,000 of appropriations which the Congress has authorized.

A study of the records of migratory movements after the First World War and the testimony of the well-known news commentator, Mr. Henry J. Taylor, in his outstanding book entitled "Men in Motion," indicate that millions of people in Europe will seek not merely a temporary refuge overseas but rather a permanent severance of all ties with their native lands. "Europe," says Mr. Taylor, "remains overcrowded to the extent of something like 60,000,000 people." (Men in Motion, p. 104). " * * * Europe's only hope is a second gigantic migration * * *" (ibid., p. 106).

"The story of migrations is the story of small movements which accumulate as the result of small events. As the small migrations accumulate the great waves of migration appear to be dormant, but when the accumulations have taken place events occur. And with these events, such as World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, the next great wave of migration breaks out again, and man populates the earth.

"Yet the chances are overwhelming that, if Americans are not exceedingly watchful, we shall find the Europeans knocking at the doors of the United States and urging us to let them in here.

"It hardly seems conceivable that we should be so dull and thoughtless as to permit this. But there are many indications that it can happen and that Africa, the other colonies, and the dominions will be passed over by the Europeans, preserved in very much their present state, while arguments will be advanced, presumably along so-called humanitarian lines, to obtain immigration to the United States" (ibid., pp. 108-109).

Mr. Taylor concludes his chapter "Europeans can make this contribution" with the following pertinent remarks, "First, all refugees are not good refugees. Europe was very glad to get rid of many of these people, some of whom exasperated everyone abroad with their infatuation for thinking and talking and not working. Others had been ceaseless trouble makers wherever they were, castigating all who disagreed with them and assuming a superiority to which they somehow claimed title by virtue of the fact that Europe was old and wise and they were Europeans. * * * Second, we should not take any immigrants at all. We are doing other welfare services. We are doing them on a scale so vast that our gifts are nearly beyond enumeration. We should not receive refugees in exchange." Mr. Taylor speaks from personal observation. He has traveled over 100,000 miles by air. Men in Motion is a compilation of his findings. It is a great book and every American should read it and heed what he has to say.

Africa is the solution of the refugee problem. Our armies have overrun Morocco (the French Zone), Algiers, and Tunis. The

British hold Egypt and conquered Tripoli. Tunis is only 303 miles from Naples. The area of its territory is something over 43,000 square miles, or approximately that of North Carolina. The population of Tunis is 2,608,313, with a density per square mile considerably less than that of North Carolina. Tunis has been a substantial exporter of foodstuffs. For example: In 1937 Tunis exported grain to the value of 232,025,000 francs; live animals to the amount of 24,824,000 francs; animal products, 72,834,000 francs; vegetable oils, 134,169,000 francs; beverages and wines, 152,104,000 francs; and fruits and seeds, 43,444,000 francs.

The city of Algiers, the capital of Algeria, is only 581 miles from Naples. The population of Algiers was, according to the census of 1936, 7,234,684, settled on an area of 847,000 square miles; that is to say, Algeria is only a trifle smaller than the combined areas of the States of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada. Algeria, like Tunis, has been also a substantial exporter of foodstuffs. For example, in 1937, Algeria exported the following: Animal products valued at 426,218,000 francs and vegetable products at 3,379,701,000 francs. The French Zone of Morocco, which is now under our military control, has an area of approximately 200,000 square miles, or, let us say, about twice the size of the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania combined. A census of the French Zone taken in 1936 shows a total population of 6,298,528. Agriculture is by far the most important industry and, like Tunis and Algeria, Morocco has been an exporter of foodstuffs. In 1938 Morocco exported cattle, sheep, and pigs to the value of 45,952,000 francs; eggs, 62,647,000 francs; wheat 192,849,000 francs; barley, 32,511,000 francs; dried vegetables, 59,498,000 francs, and fish, 90,373,000 francs.

It will be observed that the combined area of these sparsely settled provinces of North Africa is substantially greater than a third of the area of continental United States, and that it is not merely potentially an important source of foodstuffs but that prior to the outbreak of war it was a large exporter of these commodities to markets which are now closed. That is to say, these provinces are capable now of supporting a large population of refugees from their own resources provided that the allied military establishments are maintained by supplies shipped in from overseas. In this connection it must not be forgotten that the United States is now importing foodstuffs from the Argentine (cf. New York Sun, June 14, 1944) to supplement our domestic supplies. Inasmuch as the steaming distance from Buenos Aires to Algiers is only 5,453 miles as compared with a steaming distance of 5,871 miles to New York, it is wholly illogical to import refugees to the United States on the theory that it is easier to feed them here than in Africa.

When to these facts are added the hazards of shipping refugees 4,200 miles from Naples to New York in time of war, as compared

with transporting them only 300 miles to Tunis and less than 600 miles to Algiers, the humanitarian argument is completely demolished.

The second question raised by the President's order to admit 1,000 refugees "outside of the regular immigration procedure" presents to the Congress and to the American people a problem of constitutional law of the first magnitude. That question is this: Has the President the power to set aside an act or any part of an act of Congress restricting or prohibiting the entrance of aliens or certain classes of aliens into the United States on the theory that in time of war he has an unlimited reservoir of constitutional and statutory powers which are sufficient to sustain such extraordinary action? Here is what the President says: "You should bear in mind that since these refugees are to be placed in a camp in the United States under appropriate security restrictions, the procedure for the selection of the refugees and arrangements for bringing them here should be as simple and expeditious as possible, uncomplicated by any of the usual formalities involved in admitting people to the United States under the immigration laws." Excerpt from President's cable to Ambassador Murphy.)

It will be recalled that in the autumn of 1942, the President, in a special message to Congress, asked that the power be delegated to him to annul any immigration law or part thereof wholly, or to such extent as he deemed necessary, in order to facilitate his conduct of the war. In one of the introductory paragraphs of this memorandum it has been pointed out that when a bill providing for such a delegation of power came before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives for consideration, that committee unanimously declined to report the bill to Congress. This request from the President for a delegation of power and the testimony of the Attorney General before the Ways and Means Committee in support of what was called the third war powers bill would seem to establish beyond dispute that all preceding grants of authority did not go so far as to authorize any such order as the President has now issued in respect to the entry of the 1,000 refugees referred to in his special message to Congress on June 12, 1944.

In a letter to a United States Senator of which the substance is set forth in the New York Daily News of June 27, 1944, the Attorney General appears to have completely reversed the opinion that he gave to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on November 18, 1942, respecting the necessity of additional legislation to relieve the President from mandatory provisions of the immigration laws. He now seeks to draw an analogy between the admission of refugees under the President's order and the detention of prisoners of war outside of the requirements of these statutes. No such analogy is justified because the status of prisoners of war has definite statutory

recognition and the conditions of their detention are specifically provided for in a series of international conventions to which the United States is a party. The most recent of these conventions is set forth in a United States Government publication, Treaty Series No. 846, entitled "Prisoners of War."

The reference by the Attorney General to the internment of the crews of Russian war vessels in the course of the Russo-Japanese War, is neither relevant nor pertinent. The obligation of a neutral government to intern members of the armed forces of a belligerent who enter their territory has long been established by generally accepted provisions of international law. This recognition of the law of nations respecting the internment of armed land or naval forces of a belligerent nation is specifically referred to in title 18, section 37 of the United States Code. There is nothing of a comparable nature covering refugees. A refugee seeks to enter a foreign country of his own initiative. Prisoners of war are members of the armed forces of the enemy and the only civilians who are covered by the international convention, to which reference has already been made, are specifically limited to special classes "such as newspaper correspondents and reporters, contractors, who fall into the enemies' hands and whom the latter think it expedient to retain." Such persons, be it noted, in order to be entitled to the privileges of treatment as prisoners of war, must have in their possession a certificate from the military authorities of the armed forces which they were accompanying.

The Attorney General goes even further in trying to develop his analogy between refugees and prisoners of war, by pointing to a recent practice of our Government in admitting into the United States German, Italian, and Japanese nationals who have been deported by Latin-American countries to the United States under an arrangement whereby they are interned in this country. The legality of such an arrangement, whereby civilian political prisoners of a foreign nation have been admitted into the United States for internment, should be scrutinized with the greatest care. That these people constituted a grave danger to the Latin-American countries which deported them is self-evident.

It would seem, therefore, to be a reasonable assumption that they are members of one or the other of the Fascist or Nazi subversive groups who constructively fall within the scope of the provisions of title 8, section 137. That is to say, presumptively they believe in the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. If they do, the law is explicit. Such persons are mandatorily excluded from entry into the United States. If such persons are found in the United States, the executive branch of the Government is under a mandate to deport them whence they came (cf. title 8, sec. 137, subsec. (g)). It is suggested also that the provisions of law discussed in the following paragraph have a bearing on the pro-

priety, or rather impropriety, of admitting these aliens. Certainly, it can safely be said that there is no justification in this action of our Government for an assumption of authority to admit refugees outside of the regular immigration procedure.

Title 8, section 144, relating to the "bringing in or harboring or concealing certain aliens" expressly prohibits any person from bringing in or even landing in the United States any aliens not duly admitted by an immigration inspector or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States. In order that there may be no doubt as to the meaning of this section, it is here set forth in full:

"Sec. 144. Any person, including the master, agent, owner, or consignee of any vessel, who shall bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall attempt, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall conceal or harbor or attempt to conceal or harbor or assist or abet another to conceal or harbor, in any place, including any building, vessel, railway car, conveyance, or vehicle, any alien not duly admitted by an immigrant inspector or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 and by imprisonment, for a term not exceeding 5 years for each and every alien so landed or brought in or attempted to be landed or brought in" (Feb. 5, 1917, ch. 29).

It should be observed that the use of the words "any person" is all inclusive, and standing by itself this section clearly prohibits the admission of aliens "outside of the regular immigration procedure" by any official of the United States. This section of the immigration laws, however, does not stand by itself. It is fortified by the provisions of title 8, section 136, of the United States Code which enumerates the classes of aliens excluded from admission into the United States. Subsection (b) of this section enumerates paupers and similar indigent aliens, but even more important and decisive, is the mandatory provision of subsection (1) that "persons likely to become a public charge" are excluded. Obviously refugees imported by the United States on United States ships and maintained in a camp at the expense of the American taxpayer are not merely likely to become public charges, but they are ipso facto public charges.

The fact that the refugees whose admission is specifically ordered by the President must be definitely classified as public charges is established by the following excerpts from a memorandum sent by the President on June 8 to the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior, the Director of the Budget, and the Executive Director of the War Refugee Board. "These refugees will be brought into this country outside of the regular immigration

procedure and placed in Fort Ontario near Oswego, N. Y."

"(4) Until U. N. R. R. A. is in a position to assume the financial responsibilities involved, the Bureau of the Budget shall make arrangements for financing the project, using to the extent possible any available funds of the War Department, the War Relocation Authority, and the War Refugee Board, and from the foreign war relief appropriation, and, if necessary, drawing upon the President's emergency fund."

Subsection (i) of section 136 of title VIII of the United States Code is further fortified by the succeeding subsection of this section, which provides that "persons whose tickets or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who are assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such persons do not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes;" * * * It is indisputable, as has already been pointed out, that refugees belong to one of the excluded classes, that is to say, as persons likely to become a public charge (subsec. (i), and possibly also as paupers or vagrants (subsec. (b)). All persons mandatorily excluded from admission into the United States by title VIII, section 136, are, therefore, "not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States" within the meaning of title VIII, section 144, of the United States Code, to which reference has already been made. These provisions of law are conclusive against the admission of refugees "outside of the regular immigration procedure," as contemplated in the President's order.

It may, perhaps, be well to add that "any alien who at the time of entry was a member of one or more of the classes excluded by law" is mandatorily deportable if found within the United States at any time within 5 years after entry (cf. title 8, sec. 155, U. S. C.). Furthermore, if an alien happens to belong to one of the subversive groups, he is deportable at any time after entry (cf. title 8, sec. 137, subsec. (g)).

It is wholly erroneous to suppose that there is any provision of the immigration laws which authorizes the admission for temporary residence in the United States of any of the classes of aliens who are mandatorily excluded by law. It is evident that the refugees who have been ordered to be admitted by the President "outside the regular immigration procedure" are also mandatorily excluded by the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924. That is to say, not only because of the probable exhaustion of the quotas applicable to the countries of which they are citizens, but also because title 8, section 202, subsection (f) prohibits a consular officer from issuing an immigration visa to any alien whom he knows or has reason to believe is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws and subsection (g) which provides that "nothing in this chapter shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, to whom an immigration visa has been issued, to enter the United

States, if, upon arrival in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws."

As has already been pointed out, the refugees are unquestionably mandatorily excluded from entering into the United States by title 8, section 136, subsection (i) and title 8, section 144. Be it noted in connection with the various provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924, that under section 223, the provisions of that law are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws, and shall be enforced as a part of such laws, and all the penal or other provisions of such laws, not inapplicable, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this law. Attention is particularly directed to the fact that an alien, although admissible under the provisions of this law, shall not be admitted into the United States if he is excluded by any provision of the immigration laws other than this law, and an alien admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than this law, shall not be admitted into the United States if he is excluded by any provision of the Immigration Act of 1924.

In accordance with the terms of section 223, it is perfectly clear that refugees for reasons repeatedly set forth above are not admissible as nonimmigrants as defined in section 203.

At the beginning of this discussion of the legal aspects of the President's order to admit 1,000 refugees, it was pointed out that from the President's effort to secure a delegation of power from Congress to annul the immigration laws in whole or in part, it is fair to assume that he not only had no such power but also that he did not believe he had such authority. There has been an erroneous assumption by some people that because the Constitution designates the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy, he has acquired an extension of civil powers not specifically conferred upon him by law. The fact is that the President has no power by virtue of his position of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to set aside an act of Congress. Indeed, an examination of the Constitution shows that the Congress is specifically authorized "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces" (art. I, sec. 8). The President, therefore, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is definitely subjected to the rules laid down by the Congress for the government and regulation of the armed forces that he commands. Any other interpretation of the President's powers would imply that we have now existing in the United States the same evils which we are combating in Europe and Asia.

At the moment, there is before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in the House of Representatives, a series of resolutions identical in purpose. These resolutions are numbered as follows: House Resolution 576, introduced by Mr. DICKSTEIN, of New York, chairman of the House Committee

on Immigration and Naturalization; House Resolution 531, introduced by Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts; House Resolution 583, introduced by Mr. ROWAN, of Illinois; House Resolution 584, introduced by Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York; House Resolution 585, introduced by Mr. SCANLON, of Pennsylvania; House Resolution 587, introduced by Mr. CELLER, of New York; House Resolution 588, introduced by Mr. TORRENS, of New York; House Resolution 594, introduced by Mr. BYRNE, of New York.

With the exception of the resolution introduced by Mr. CELLER, House Resolution 587, who uses a different phraseology to express the same purpose as those of his colleagues, the text of these resolutions appears to be identical, and, as they seem to follow the phraseology used by Mr. DICKSTEIN, a copy of his resolution, House Resolution 576, follows:

"Whereas it is common knowledge that countless thousands of innocent persons, of all racial groups and religious beliefs, in many of the countries of continental Europe have been murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted by the Axis nations; and

"Whereas it is accepted by well-informed people that unless something is done in the immediate future countless more thousands will be murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted; and

Whereas under the present existing immigration laws, unlike the limitation on the number of persons who may come to the United States permanently as immigrants, there is no such limitation on the number of those who may come temporarily; and

Whereas the United States can and should contribute its facilities for the temporary relief of such persons by admitting some of these distressed people temporarily to specified areas to be known as free ports for refugees: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should take such action as is necessary, within Executive powers under existing law, to admit temporarily into designated areas within the United States, to be known as free ports for refugees, aliens who can establish satisfactorily that they are bona fide political or religious refugees from countries in continental Europe, such temporary admission to be conditioned that such aliens will remain in the prescribed areas, will be admitted for a period not to exceed 6 months after hostilities have ceased, and shall not thereby be considered as having acquired any rights to be or remain in the United States: *Provided, however*, That it is further the sense of the Congress that no persons should be admitted, in accordance with the spirit of this resolution, if they are afflicted with any loathsome, dangerous, or contagious diseases.

"It is further urged as being within the spirit of this resolution that as time is strictly of the essence in the success of the purpose of the resolution, the President is urged to act as soon as possible."

604805—8395

An analysis of this resolution which, as has already been said, is in substance identical with those enumerated in a preceding paragraph demonstrates a curious misapprehension both of the facts of the situation and of the law. Obviously the passage of a resolution by the Congress recommending to the President that he should take such action as is necessary to admit refugees on a temporary basis can have no effect whatsoever in preventing the murder in the immediate future of countless thousands of unfortunates who have incurred Hitler's enmity and are still within the reach of his ruthless minions.

In an earlier section of this memorandum a practical and reasonable solution for the rescue and rehabilitation of refugees who have escaped from Axis territory is clearly set forth without a reversal of our immigration policy or the necessity of any amendment of our immigration laws.

As Mr. Pegler well said in one of his recent columns: "Past performances in many fields instinctively suggest that the promise that these refugees will be repatriated after the war and meanwhile restricted will not be kept. Past performances suggest also that once a principle has been conceded by importation of 1,000 European aliens with no pretense that they are eligible or suitable for permanent residence here, the number that will be brought in later will be limited by shipping facilities, individual pull exerted through personal friends and organizations in the United States, and public tolerance." (Washington Daily News, June 14, 1944.) That is the undiluted truth.

Of course, it will be understood by anyone who has carefully followed the analysis of our immigration laws set forth in the course of this memorandum that the assertion in paragraph 3 of House Resolution 576, and its counterparts, that there is no limitation on the number of aliens who may come in temporarily is utterly without foundation. The prohibition in the law against the admission of aliens liable to become a public charge is absolute. Even if it were not for the provisions of the act of 1917 forbidding the entry of various classes of aliens under any conditions, as has been set forth previously in detail, a careful reading of title 8, section 203, which enumerates the classes of aliens who are not classified as immigrants and therefore eligible for temporary admission, indicates that upon the broadest interpretation a refugee cannot constructively be brought within its provision. Here is how section 203 reads:

"When used in this chapter the term 'immigrant' means any alien departing from any place outside the United States destined for the United States except—(1) an accredited official of a foreign government recognized by the Government of the United States, (2) an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business or pleasure, (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States, (4) an alien law-

fully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory, (5) a bona fide alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter temporarily the United States solely in the pursuit of his calling as a seaman, and (6) an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation, and his wife, and his unmarried children under 21 years of age, if accompanying or following to join him."

Bearing in mind always that refugees are barred by other provisions of law than those referred to above, they nevertheless could not truthfully be classified as tourists or as visitors entering the United States temporarily for business or pleasure. A refugee who has abandoned his residence in an enemy state and forfeited his allegiance is definitely debarred from return. Indeed, the possibility of his eventual return is wholly problematical. In this connection note that under the provisions of section 220 of the Immigration Act of 1924, of which section 203 is a part, that any person who obtains, accepts, or receives any immigration visa or permit knowing it to have been procured by means of any false claim or statement is guilty of a grave offense for which he can be fined up to \$10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both. Any person who connived or assisted an alien to violate this provision would of course, be liable to prosecution for a conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States.

Finally, it may be said, that there are provisions in the immigration laws which prohibit the admission of criminals or persons who admit having committed a crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, prostitutes, procurors, or pimps; also aliens belonging to subversive groups or who believe in or advocate the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) or of any organized government, because of his or their official character. If refugees are admitted outside of the regular immigration procedure, no information as to whether or not any of them might be so classified, would be elicited.

Mr. Chairman, under the terms of the resolutions before the committee, any anarchist or Communist may be admitted upon establishing the fact that he is a bona fide political or religious refugee. The refugee may also be a white slaver, a narcotic peddler, or even an habitual criminal and yet secure admission within the spirit of the resolutions, providing only that he has not a loathsome or contagious disease.

To be sure, I recognize the fact that these persons are to be kept under restraint but if

664835-8395

the experience of the past 20 years teaches us anything, I venture to suggest it will not be long before organizations sponsoring these resolutions will be coming before your committee to lament the confinement of aliens on American soil in concentration camps because of their political or religious beliefs.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, I and my associates feel that the Congress and the American people are faced with another and most serious drive to undermine and ultimately destroy the whole policy of restriction upon immigration into the United States. It has been shown that upon humanitarian grounds it is infinitely preferable that all refugees from Axis territory be cared for temporarily in North Africa, and that the probability is that not only will these refugees not return to the land of their birth but also that there are millions in Europe who will probably be forced to migrate elsewhere on the conclusion of hostilities. Any refugees admitted into the United States now who have children born on United States soil will raise the question that they should not be deported because to do so would involve either the separation of the family or the deportation of an American citizen.

If additional legislation is necessary to establish more refugee camps in North Africa, I will urge my associates to support it. However, I think it is very clear that U. N. R. R. A. has ample authority to expand the existing camps now in the Middle East and North Africa, indefinitely.

As the matter stands, therefore, the American Coalition is opposed to the passage of any one of the resolutions whose numbers are set forth in this statement. Our organization is on record in its annual convention of this year in behalf of total exclusion of all immigration into the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN B. TREVOR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 12, 1944.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, chairman of the House Immigration Committee, and the members of the committee, dated July 27, 1944, by the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, whose national secretary is James L. Wilmeth, of Philadelphia, Pa. The letter and the statement previously submitted for the RECORD bear directly upon the question of refugees and immigrants being admitted to this country at this time at the expense of the American taxpayers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER
UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,
Philadelphia, July 27, 1944.

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, M. C.,
Chairman, House Immigration Committee,
and the Honorable Members of said
Committee, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: There are pending before your honorable committee for hearings, consideration, and report, certain House resolutions which have for their object the relief of persecuted peoples of Europe of racial and religious minorities, and commending the action of the President, etc. These House bills, and particularly House resolutions, have increased in number and volume since the invasion of Italy, when the plight of these persecuted peoples has been brought specifically to the attention of our fighting forces, and through our representatives, to the American people.

The accounts of these atrocious outrages of peace-loving people by the Axis powers constitutes one of the darkest records of persecutions in all civilized history. Allowing for some overemphasis of persecutions, wholesale king's murders and outrages which have reached us through the press and by word of mouth, we are confident that the situation of these people of racial and religious minorities is critical in the extreme, and that their sufferings from hatred and persecution know no bounds.

The resolutions in question are designated by the following numbers: House Resolution 576, by Congressman DICKSTEIN, of New York, chairman of this honorable committee; House Resolution 581, introduced by Congressman LANE, of Massachusetts; House Resolution 583, introduced by Congressman ROWAN, of Illinois; House Resolution 584, introduced by Congressman MARCANTONIO, of New York; House Resolution 585, introduced by Congressman SCANLON, of Pennsylvania; House Resolution 587, introduced by Congressman CELLER, of New York; House Resolution 588, introduced by Congressman TORRENS, of New York; and House Resolution 594, introduced by Congressman BYRNE, of New York. Practically the same text or language is used in all these resolutions, with the exception of House Resolution 587, by Congressman CELLER, and is as follows:

"Whereas it is common knowledge that countless thousands of innocent persons, of all racial groups and religious beliefs, in many of the countries of continental Europe have been murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted by the Axis nations; and

"Whereas it is accepted by well-informed people that unless something is done in the immediate future countless more thousands will be murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted; and

"Whereas under the present existing immigration laws, unlike the limitation on the number of persons who may come to the United States permanently as immigrants,

there is no such limitation on the number of those who may come temporarily; and

"Whereas the United States can and should contribute its facilities for the temporary relief of such persons by admitting some of these distressed people temporarily to specified areas to be known as free ports for refugees: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should take such action as is necessary, within Executive powers under existing law, to admit temporarily into designated areas within the United States, to be known as free ports for refugees, aliens who can establish satisfactorily that they are bona fide political or religious refugees from countries in continental Europe, such temporary admission to be conditioned that such aliens will remain in the prescribed areas, will be admitted for a period not to exceed 6 months after hostilities have ceased, and shall not thereby be considered as having acquired any rights to be or remain in the United States: Provided, however, That it is further the sense of the Congress that no persons should be admitted, in accordance with the spirit of this resolution, if they are afflicted with any loathsome, dangerous, or contagious diseases.

"It is further urged as being within the spirit of this resolution that as time is strictly of the essence in the success of the purpose of this resolution, the President is urged to act as soon as possible."

The object of these resolutions is to call attention of the people to the persecution and outrages committed upon these minorities, and to declare that in the sense of the House of Representatives the President should take such necessary action to admit temporarily, into designated areas within the United States, refugees, it being expressly stated that "within Executive powers and under existing law" the President should act.

We submit that there is nothing in the existing immigration laws which would authorize the Chief Executive of this Nation to set aside the immigration laws in order to effectuate the "sense of the House of Representatives as expressed in this resolution." If, then, existing law does not permit the admittance of these refugees under the resolutions the action proposed to be taken by the President is limited to within executive powers under existing law. The President, in his message to Congress, dated June 12, 1944, states that the purpose of establishing the War Refugee Board was closely related to our whole war effort. We fail to see wherein the establishment of the War Refugee Board or the action of the President in establishing havens of refuge in this country is related to the war effort. Such action will certainly not contribute to the final outcome of the war. It must, therefore, be based on humanitarian grounds. It is doubtful if the President possesses the power to take this action under existing law

or in the exercise of war powers conferred upon him by Congress. Otherwise why was a message submitted to Congress by the President in 1912 requesting plenary powers over the movement of persons and things, which request was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee and, after due consideration, the authority was refused? The exercise of power which these resolutions encourage the President to exercise do not seem to be in keeping with the plenary power he requested over movement of persons, and to our minds there is a close relationship between the two.

The President states in his message of June 12, 1944, that in view of the urgency and extremity of the situation he has taken steps to save additional lives, and that this is being done by establishing havens of refuge here in America, where these persecuted peoples can find temporary housing in unused Army camps where they can be cared for, fed, clothed, and receive medical attention, and that arrangements have been made to bring immediately to this country 1,000 refugees who, at the close of the war, will be sent back to their homelands.

We submit for the consideration of this honorable committee that the United States has immigration laws which have been worked out over a long stretch of years, for the purpose of keeping out of America undesirable aliens. These immigration laws are worked out in much detail, and the exact steps to be taken before an alien can be considered for admission to the United States as a resident have to be complied with in much detail. These restrictions, limitations, and directions as to procedure apply on both sides of the ocean—to the consular officers of the United States in the country from which the alien desires to emigrate and also to the port of entry where the immigrant lands.

The people of the United States have adopted these immigration laws for their own protection. It may be stated that while strict, these regulations are extremely liberal—much more so than those of other countries, even nations who, in this war, are our allies.

Prior to the adoption of the immigration laws of 1917 the United States was an open country and was most generous in the admission of aliens. The law of 1917 imposed restrictions, as did the act of 1924, which established quota provisions based upon the census of 1890 as to the number of immigrants admitted from various countries. The Congress acted wisely in enacting restrictive measures. Restriction is now a well-settled policy with the American people. These laws were enacted for the protection of our citizenship, and applied to social conditions as well as to labor and economics.

The present measures and House resolutions and the message of the President, to which reference is made above, have for their object the temporary suspension of our immigration laws. It is now proposed to bring

in 1,000 of these people from southern Italy, regardless of immigration laws and regulations. Notwithstanding the solemn promise that these refugees will be repatriated after the war, we are fearful that this promise may not be fulfilled.

There is no statement contained in any of these measures. Resolutions, or the message of the President, that these aliens are eligible or qualified for American citizenship. The entire action is based on humanitarian grounds. Apparently no selection whatever is to be made of these immigrants, but they are to be brought over en masse, regardless of qualifications or former associations. How are we to know whether certain of them are criminals, Communists, crooks, or otherwise undesirable? There seems to be a feeling that refugees are being ennobled by their sufferings. We contend that the plan adopted is not best either for the persecuted peoples or for the people of the United States. Granting that this may be but a temporary expedient, it will be a costly one for the people of the United States as to travel, subsistence, housing, and lodging.

If we are to judge refugee immigrants by those alien immigrants who came here before or during the first World War who did not undertake any activity in destroying the very tyrants who had oppressed them, but instead joined groups and movements which had for their object the destruction of the American system of government, we may expect no gain or benefit by their being brought here now.

The American people have the right, and have exercised that right through Congress, to say who shall come as aliens for temporary or permanent residence in the United States. That pronouncement has been made in our laws and is binding on the legislative and executive branches of our Government as well as the people under whose direction these laws were enacted.

The right is reserved in our laws to reject applicants for admission to the United States who do not meet certain requirements. These restrictions are not unjust to foreigners, because foreigners have no rights in the matter, neither have these refugees any rights to admission. When an alien is admitted to this country and later becomes a citizen, that is a privilege conferred upon him by our laws, and it cannot be construed as an inherent right. The United States through its Congress can legislate to exclude all immigration, and, for that matter, to restrict the right to vote and hold public office to native-born American citizens.

We think the admission of 1,000 refugees from southern Italy as a sample would not make any very great difference in the problem of taking care of them at public expense, but we are fearful that this first 1,000 would be the beginning or first movement and that there would be many other thousands to follow with the conditions of their admission being gradually relaxed, and through appeals for sympathy our immigration laws would be further set aside, and there would be con-

ferred a legitimate immigrant status on unselected thousands, with almost complete disregard of legal standards or desirability.

We also fear that when the war is over we will hear nothing more about these refugee aliens being returned to their homelands. Due to intolerable social and political conditions in the European countries whence they come, repatriation may be impossible. It is, therefore, likely that Congress will be asked to relax the provisions of the immigration laws to permit these refugees to settle here in America permanently.

We contend that suffering cannot be made the basis for the flaunting of laws of long standing, and setting them aside by Executive order, on the theory that the action taken will contribute to the war. How much is the war going to be promoted by the bringing in of one thousand or tens of thousands of refugees to the United States? Probably not one iota. We are not satisfied that this problem is being handled legally or in the interest of our American people.

The annual report of the Attorney General discloses that quotas from many European countries are not being filled, let alone exceeded. Why would it not be a better plan, as well as legal, to admit these refugees under the quota system from these countries of which they are citizens? If there is to be mass movements of these people such as is indicated by the first thousand, why should not the War Refugee Board make arrangements to settle these people in places where they can contribute something to the growth and development of the country? There is plenty of room in Palestine, but there are some political considerations which might interfere. Shall America be made the dumping ground of persecuted refugees because Great Britain does not choose to stand by the Balfour agreement made following the First World War, for settlement of racial minorities in Palestine? What is to hinder our Government, through the Secretary of State, who is Chairman of the War Refugee Board, from taking up with those countries which have dominions in northern Africa, where immigration is badly needed to develop growth of the country, the proposition of settling these refugee people in those sparsely settled regions permanently where their work is needed and where they can earn a living and contribute something to the public good?

What good will it do these people to be housed here in Army camps so far as their ultimate good is concerned, to be fed and clothed at public expense? The best thing that can be done for any people is to put them in position so they can provide for themselves and earn their own living, whether it's farming, merchandising, or any other of the usual avocations of life. If these people could be located in places where their work and labor are needed, and the same help extended to them on the basis of the same expense as will be involved in bringing them here, maintaining and returning them, they will have something in these new-found

homes in Africa and Palestine by which they may be able to establish themselves and to earn an honest living.

We hope some better way can be devised for helping these poor peoples than the temporary expedient which is being adopted and that the House Immigration Committee in its wisdom may so amend the resolutions and bills now before it as to bring out a legal measure which will not be open to question and not in violation of immigration statutes.

Respectfully submitted,

W. A. CLARK,
ROSS HORNER,
R. L. McCLANNAN,
National Legislative Committee.
R. B. GARRETT,
National Councilor.
WM. H. MURPHY,
National Vice Councilor.
RALPH MORRIS,
Junior Past National Councilor,
National Board of Officers.
JAMES L. WILMETH,
National Secretary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I address this question to the Senator from North Carolina. If his amendment is adopted, will it result in doing away with the present control quotas on immigration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would provide an absolute bar?

Mr. REYNOLDS. An absolute bar; yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator feel that it would be better to maintain strict control quotas and really enforce them, rather than to provide this absolute bar against any person coming into the country?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should say, Mr. President, absolutely not, because we have in this country, as the testimony has revealed, between five and six million aliens, and they are taking jobs which rightfully belong to our own citizens, our own men and women who are bleeding and dying at this time for this country and to save the homelands of many of these aliens. I respectfully submit that it is at least my duty to try to keep out of this country every person who would take a job which rightfully belongs to an American citizen, who may at this time be bleeding and dying for his country. We should save jobs for those of our men and women who are now in the armed services all over the world, who will need jobs at the end of the war, as well as men and women who

will come out of our war plants and who will be wanting jobs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator from North Carolina that, as he well knows, I have stood constantly against extended entrance of aliens into this country, but it seems to me that with strictly controlled quotas established under law, and with a proper regulation according to law, the situation can be met, rather than by an absolute freezing against any individual coming here. There are instances when it is proper to admit into this country persons of other lands—for instance, when they may send for an immediate member of the family. I am in agreement with the Senator from North Carolina with respect to preventing any extended immigration. And I stand also on the proposition that American people must be given the first opportunities of work here and protected in that right. But an absolute bar against any individual's coming in seems severe. Let the subject be strictly controlled to the best advantage of our own country and our own people.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does the Senator wish to ask me a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I have no question to ask the Senator. I wish to ask for the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from North Carolina concluded?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Is a motion to refer the pending amendment to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it would not be in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I had hoped, Mr. President, that it would be in order, to the end that we might send so important and so substantive a matter to a standing committee of the Senate for consideration, because at this hour in the consideration of the pending bill, for us to attempt to pass upon the substance of a law which has been carefully arrived at after considerable study, and which is embodied not only in the immigration laws of 1924, but as amended in 1940,

would be to take a grievously unfair and erroneous course. I feel so strongly on the subject that I would have been perfectly willing to submit the matter to the consideration of a standing committee, which might inquire into all the facts, but in the absence of parliamentary provision making that course possible I must strenuously object to the amendment as offered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, to-day there has been discussion of a controversial matter during which some mention was made that the unions and that they were exerting too much influence here. I am for organized labor. I am glad to see the labor unions of this country taking much more interest in public affairs. In many letters which I have received from virtually every State of the Union the writers say that the American people should take more interest in our public affairs. I am glad to see the labor unions take more interest in our public affairs, because that will result in making others take more interest in public affairs. Being interested, as I am, in the unions themselves, and particularly in the union members, and being interested in seeing that the dues-paying members are well advised regarding the conduct of their respective unions, and being interested in seeing to it that no Communists or Nazis or Fascists shall be officers or members of unions, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

Whereas it is essential that the public be fully informed with respect to the activities of the various labor organizations whose members are engaged in the production of articles and materials which are vital to the war effort; and

Whereas the officers and agents of such organizations should all be American citizens whose allegiance to the United States is unquestioned and who can be depended upon to aid the Government in suppressing industrial sabotage and other subversive activities which tend to impede, undermine, or defeat the war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act and annually thereafter every labor union or other labor organization (a) which represents, or purports to represent in any manner the interests of any persons employed by any business enterprise which is engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the production of goods for such commerce or for national defense or war purposes, or (b) whose activities in representing the interests of employees extend to more than one State, shall through its president or other authorized officer, register its identity with the Department of Labor, and state under oath the following information, and such other information as the Secretary of Labor may by regulation prescribe:

- (1) The name of the labor union or other labor organization;
- (2) The address at which it has its principal office or does business;
- (3) The names, titles, and salaries of its officers;
- (4) The initiation fees charged each member;
- (5) The annual dues charged each member;
- (6) The assessments levied against its members during the past 12-month period;
- (7) The limitations on membership;
- (8) The number of paid-up members;
- (9) The date of the last election of officers;
- (10) The method of election of officers;
- (11) The vote for and against each candidate for office at any election held during the past 12-month period; and
- (12) The date of the last detailed financial statement, if any, furnished to all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement.

With such information there shall be filed a copy of the constitution and bylaws of the labor union or other labor organization, and there shall be filed under oath a detailed and intelligible financial statement showing the receipts and expenditures of such labor union or other labor organization during the past 12-month period.

SEC. 2. Every such labor union or other labor organization established after the date of enactment of this joint resolution shall, when established and annually thereafter, register with the Department of Labor and furnish the information required of existing labor unions and other labor organizations under the preceding section.

SEC. 3. Any labor union or other labor organization which fails to register with the Department of Labor and file the information required by this act shall be disqualified to

act as the representative of employees in collective bargaining during any period that such failure continues and, in addition, shall be fined not more than \$5,000.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall hereafter be unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization which is required to register with the Department of Labor to have as an officer or agent any person—

- (1) who is not a citizen of the United States;
- (2) who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi bund organization;
- (3) who has been a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi bund organization within the 2-year period prior to the date of enactment of this act;
- (4) who is ineligible to hold public office; or
- (5) who has lost his rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

It shall be the duty of each such labor union or other labor organization to use due diligence to determine whether any of its officers or agents is a person who is prohibited from being such an officer or agent under the provisions of this subsection.

(b) It shall hereafter be unlawful for any person described in subsection (a) to be an officer or agent of any such labor union or other labor organization.

(c) Any labor union or other labor organization, or any person, who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$10,000; and each such violation shall be deemed to be a separate offense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is not this amendment the same as Senate Joint Resolution 9?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Which the Senator introduced in January 1943?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the committee take any action on it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It did not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it still pending in the committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is still pending.



